



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,883	11/07/2000	L. Carlton Brown JR.	06969-022320US	2938
7590	12/14/2005		EXAMINER	CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A
Sujit B Kotwal Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP Two Embarcadero Center 8th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621				
DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/708,883	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner Salvatore Cangialosi	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18,20-38,40-57 and 60 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18,20-38,40-57 and 60 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-18, 20-38, 40-57, and 60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The independent claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification as originally filed contains no support for "first... and second Zip codes that is different from the first Zip code". There are new claims without support in the specification. This is the first instance of this invention which is unrelated and unsupported by the original filing. Cancellation of the new matter is required. The specification has support for different addresses but not different Zip codes.

2. Claims 3-6, 8-9, 23-25, 28-29, 43-45, 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

Art Unit: 3621

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Certain claims (3, 6, 8, 23, 28, 43) contain the terms "to be printed... to be valid... may be... to be printed...may be used... to be printed... may be used..." which are not positive limitations. (See In re Collier, 158 USPQ 266) It is not clear what is being claimed. The claims require only a potentiality or possibility rather than an actual limitation. For example, anything is possible given sufficient time and resources. They also specify intended uses, capabilities that will result upon the performance of future acts which are not positive limitations.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. Claims 1-18, 20-38, 40-57, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gravell et al (5943658)

Art Unit: 3621

or Bator et al (6839691) in view of Brasington et al (5923406) and Whitehouse (6005945).

Regarding claim 1, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a method for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding the printing limitations of claim 2, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in

Art Unit: 3621

response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the serial number limitations of claims 3-5, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the credit limitations of claim 6, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request based on credit accounts that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the server limitations of claims 7-8, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a server based single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the cryptographic limitations of claim 10, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the security limitations of claims 11-12, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the server limitations of claims

Art Unit: 3621

13-15, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a server based single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 16, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a method for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 17, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30,

Art Unit: 3621

Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a method for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 18, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a method for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous

Art Unit: 3621

requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 20, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a method for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person

Art Unit: 3621

having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 21, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding the printing limitations of claim 22, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines

Art Unit: 3621

5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding the serial number limitations of claims 23-25, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the credit limitations of claim 26, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request based on credit accounts that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the server limitations of claims 27-29, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a server based single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the cryptographic limitations of claim 30, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the security limitations of claims

Art Unit: 3621

31-32, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the server limitations of claims 33-35, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a server based single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 36, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents

Art Unit: 3621

with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 37, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 38, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality

Art Unit: 3621

of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 40, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the

Art Unit: 3621

use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 41, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim

Art Unit: 3621

limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding the printing limitations of claim 42, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding the serial number limitations of claims 43-45, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the credit limitations of claim 46, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request based on credit accounts that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the server limitations of claims 47-49, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a server based single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the cryptographic

Art Unit: 3621

limitations of claim 50, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the security limitations of claims 51-55, Whitehouse (see abstract) show digital signature cryptography that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 56, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 57, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30,

Art Unit: 3621

Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication. Regarding claim 60, Gravell et al (See abstract, Figs. 1, 2, Col. 2, lines 5-30, Cols. 3, lines 1-20, claims 1-13) or Bator et al (See Figs. 1-6, Col. 3, lines 35-45) disclose a means for a single license generating, validating and printing postage in response to a user request from a plurality of Zip Codes the substantially as claimed. It is noted that the prior art shows requests separated in time in different zips (Transfer of license). The claims do not require simultaneous

Art Unit: 3621

requests. It would also appear that postal regulations require that each postal license must be limited to a single Zip code. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific phraseology. Both Brasington et al and Whitehouse are extensively discussed on pages 9-13 of the previous office action dated 3/22/05. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for either Gravell et al or Bator et al because the postal license structures are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment is a necessary component of postal authentication.

Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Applicants arguments dated 06/27/2005 are moot due the new grounds of rejections, which were necessitated by the amendment

Serial Number: 09/708,883

19

Art Unit: 3621

filed 06/27/2005.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (703) 872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Salvatore Cangialosi
SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222